



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,610	05/17/2006	Haraldur Thorkelsson	P4806US00	3542
11764 7590 06/10/2011 Ditthavong Mori & Steiner, P.C. 918 Prince Street Alexandria, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
BHATIA, AJAY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/10/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@dcpatent.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/579,610
Filing Date: May 17, 2006
Appellant(s): THORKESSON ET AL.

Phouphanomketh Dithavong
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 5/23/2011 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/23/2010.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application: Claims 1-17, 20-27 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munarriz et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 20020156871) in view of Kadyk et al. (United States Patent 6895425).

Claims 18, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munarriz-Kadyk in view of Wener et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 20060085429)

Claims 19, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munarriz-Kadyk in view of Gorty et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 20050171996A1)

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

20050171996	Gorty et al.	8-2005
20060085429	Wener et al.	4-2006
20020156871	Munarriz et al.	10-2002
6895425	Kadyk et al.	5-2005

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17, 20-27 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munarriz et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 20020156871) in view of Kadyk et al. (United States Patent 6895425).

For claim 1, Munarriz teaches, a system, comprising:

a server; (Munarriz, paragraph 52, email server)

a gateway, wherein; (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway)

a wireless network interconnects a device and said gateway, the device comprising a communication client; (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

wherein a broadband network interconnects said gateway and said server;
(Munarriz, paragraph 62, figure 8)

wherein when said client transmits a single self-contained request to said gateway via said wireless network to retrieve a set of e-mail related information from said server, said gateway retrieves at least said e-mail related information from, (Munarriz, paragraph 54, HTTP POST.request, email headers list), compiles said retrieved information into a single self contained response and transmits said single

response via said wireless network to said communication client. (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, compiled into XML file)

Munarriz fails to explicitly disclose, said server via said broadband network using a plurality of transactions

Kadyk teaches, said server via said broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place between the gateway and the server, (Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, sequence)

Munarriz and Kadyk are both in the field of wireless devices

Munarriz and Kadyk are compatible since Munarriz is designed to operate with multiple types of applications, Kadyk, Col. 2 line 60 to Col. 3 line 3)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz and Kadyk, by using Kadyk's method of sequencing commands to retrieve the email of Munarriz, because by combining it allows for simplified and smaller devices. (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)

For claim 2, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the system as in claim 1, wherein said self-contained request and said single response form a stateless request-response pair.

(Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, routine) and (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, compiled into XML file) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 2.

For claim 3, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the system as in claim 1, wherein said server is an Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server and said gateway further comprises an IMAP client application for communicating with said Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server. (Munarriz, paragraph 56, IMAP)

For claim 4, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the system as in claim 1, wherein said server is a post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server and said gateway further comprises an POP3 client application for communicating with said Post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server. (Munarriz, paragraph 56, POP3)

For claim 5, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, wherein said server is a simple mail transfer protocol (SMTP) compatible server and said gateway further comprises an SMTP client application for communicating with said SMTP compatible server. (Munarriz, paragraph 44, smtp)

For claim 6, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the system as in claim 1, wherein said gateway further comprises an application for monitoring e-mail traffic. (Munarriz, paragraph 59, subscriber database)

For claim 7, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the system as in claim 1, further comprising a mobile operator network, wherein said gateway is an extension of said mobile operator network. (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway)

For claim 8, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the system as in claim 1, wherein said single self-contained request and said single self contained response are transmitted using hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP). (Munarriz, paragraph 23, 25, HTTP)

For claim 9, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the system as in claim 1, wherein said single self-contained request and said single self contained response are implemented using an extensible markup language XML structure. (Munarriz, paragraph 43, XML)

For claim 10, Munarriz teaches, An apparatus comprising:

At least on processor; and (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

At least one memory including computer program code for one or more programs, th at least one memory and the computer program code configured to, with the at least on processor, cause the apparatus to perform at leas the following, (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

receive from a client application of a device, via a wireless network, a single self-contained request at a first interface, wherein said first interface is interconnected with said wireless network , (Munarriz, paragraph 54, paragraph 54, HTTP POST.request,

email headers) retrieve at least said email related information from an email server via a second interface and (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, compiled into XML file)

Munarriz fails to clearly disclose, said second interface and the broadband network using a plurality of transactions

Kadyk teaches, said second interface and the broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place between the apparatus and the server, wherein said second interface is interconnected with said broadband network, determine to compile said retrieve information into a single self contained response, and determine to transmit said single response via said interface and the mobile network to the communication client (Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, sequence, Col. 6 lines 42-56 compiling a response)

Munarriz and Kadyk are both in the field of wireless devices

Munarriz and Kadyk are compatible since Munarriz is designed to operate with multiple types of applications, Kadyk, Col. 2 line 60 to Col. 3 line 3)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz and Kadyk, by using Kadyk's method of

sequencing commands to retrieve the email of Munarriz, because by combining it allows for simplified and smaller devices. (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)

For claim 11, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the apparatus as in claim 10, wherein the server is an Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server, and said second interface is an IMAP interface. (Munarriz, paragraph 56, IMAP4)

For claim 12, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the apparatus as in claim 10, wherein the server is a Post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server, and said second interface is a POP3 interface. (Munarriz, paragraph 56 POP3)

For claim 13, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the apparatus as in claim 10, further comprising an e-mail traffic monitoring application. (Munarriz, paragraph 59, subscriber database)

For claim 14, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the apparatus as in claim 10, wherein said single self-contained request and response are transmitted using hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) and said first interface is an HTTP interface. (Munarriz, paragraph 23, 25, HTTP)

For claim 15, Munarriz teaches, a method comprising:

Receiving, via a wireless network, a single request for an email related information, where the single request is formed in a client application at a device; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, HTTP POST. request)

said gateway retrieving at least the e-mail related information from the server, wherein said gateway compiles said retrieved information into a single response; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, compiled into XML file)

and in said client application, retrieving the e-mail related information from said response. (Munarriz, paragraph 57, display)

Munarriz fails to clearly disclose, the broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place with the server

Kadyk teaches, the broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place with the server, determining to compile said retrieved information in a single response, Determining to transmit a single request to a gateway via the wireless network (Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, sequence, Col. 6 lines 42-56 compiling a response)

Munarriz and Kadyk are both in the field of wireless devices

Munarriz and Kadyk are compatible since Munarriz is designed to operate with multiple types of applications, Kadyk, Col. 2 line 60 to Col. 3 line 3)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz and Kadyk, by using Kadyk's method of sequencing commands to retrieve the email of Munarriz, because by combining it allows for simplified and smaller devices. (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)

For claim 16, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said request comprises a mailbox ID and further wherein said retrieving comprises logging onto the server using the mailbox ID and downloading the requested e-mail related information. (Munarriz, paragraph 47, logon)

For claim 17, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said gateway periodically determines if new e-mail is available in said mailbox and further wherein if at least one new e-mail message is available in said mailbox, said gateway transmits a new e-mail message notification to said client application via said wireless network. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification)

For claim 20, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises appending said new e-mail message notification to a subsequent single response. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification)

For claim 21, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein said device is a short message service (SMS) compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application using SMS. (Munarriz, paragraph 63, SMS)

For claim 22, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein said device is a wireless application protocol (WAP) compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application using WAP. (Munarriz, paragraph 62, WAP)

For claim 23, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein for each said new e-mail message said apparatus retrieves at least a message sender and a message subject and appends said message sender and a message subject to a new e-mail list and wherein said new e-mail message notification comprises said new e-mail list. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification, XML document)

For claim 24, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein said gateway determines a quantity of new e-mail messages available in said mailbox and said new e-mail message notification comprises said quantity. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification), it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to calculate the quantity of new messages.

For claim 25, Munarriz teaches, a method comprising:

(Munarriz, paragraph 52, email server, paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

Receiving from a client application in a device, via a wireless network, a single request at a first stateless interface for the e-mail related information, wherein said first stateless interface is interconnected with said wireless network the wireless network; ((Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file, HTTP POST. request)

in said gateway:

receiving said request at said first interface; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, HTTP POST, request, email headers list),

compiling said retrieved information into a single response; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file)

and in said client application, retrieving the e-mail related information from said response. (Munarriz, paragraph 57, display) (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file, paragraph 62, Wireless)

Munarriz fails to clearly disclose, retrieving at least the requested e-mail related information from the server via the broadband network using a plurality of transactions;

retrieving at least the requested e-mail related information from the server via the broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place with the server, where in said second interface is interconnected with said broadband network, determining to transmit single response to said client application via said first interface and said wireless network; (Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, sequence, Col. 6 lines 42-56 compiling a response)

Munarriz and Kadyk are both in the field of wireless devices

Munarriz and Kadyk are compatible since Munarriz is designed to operate with multiple types of applications, Kadyk, Col. 2 line 60 to Col. 3 line 3)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz and Kadyk, by using Kadyk's method of sequencing commands to retrieve the email of Munarriz, because by combining it allows for simplified and smaller devices. (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)

For claim 26, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said request comprises a mailbox identifier (ID) and further wherein said retrieving comprises determining to log onto the server using the mailbox ID and determining to download the requested e-mail related information. (Munarriz, paragraph 47, logon)

For claim 27, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, and wherein the method further comprises: periodically determining if new e-mail is available in said mailbox and if at least one new e-mail message is available in said mailbox, transmitting new e-mail message notification to said client application via said wireless network. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification)

For claim 30, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises appending said new e-mail message notification to a subsequent single response. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification, XML document)

For claim 31, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein said device is a short message service (SMS) compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application via SMS. (Munarriz, paragraph 63, SMS)

For claim 32, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein said device is a wireless application protocol (WAP) compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application using WAP. (Munarriz, paragraph 62, WAP)

For claim 33, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein the method further comprises: for each said new e-mail message, retrieving at least a message sender and a message subject and determining to append said message sender and a message subject to a new e-mail list, wherein said new e-mail message notification comprises said new e-mail list. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification, XML document)

For claim 34, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein the method further comprises: determining a quantity of new e-mail messages available in said mailbox, wherein said new e-mail message notification comprises said quantity. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification), it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to calculate the quantity of new messages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munarriz-Kadyk in view of Wener et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 20060085429)

For claim 18, Munarriz-Kadyk teach, the method of claim 15, wherein the server is an Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name (Munarriz, paragraph 56, IMAP4, paragraph 47, logon)

Munarriz-Kadyk fail to clearly disclose, a periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server.

Wener teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the server is an Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and a periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server. (Wener, paragraphs 30, 34-46)

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are both in the field of communicating with a Internet message access protocol (IMAP) servers

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are compatible, because Wener is the procedure of accessing a folder on a Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz-Kadyk, by setting the method of retrieve the content of the mailbox, with that of Wener using the SELECT command to retrieve the content of the mailbox on a periodic basis because it is something that is commonly done in the art. (Wener, paragraph 30, Today, most of the existing...)

For claim 28, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the server is an Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name (Munarriz, paragraph 56, IMAP4, paragraph 47, logon)

Munarriz-Kadyk fails to clearly disclose, a periodically determining technique comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server.

Wener teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the server is an Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and a periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server. (Wener, paragraphs 30, 34-46)

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are both in the field of communicating with a Internet message access protocol (IMAP) servers

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are compatible, because Wener is the procedure of accessing a folder on a Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz-Kadyk, by setting the method of retrieve the content of the mailbox, with that of Wener using the SELECT command to retrieve the content of the mailbox on a periodic basis because it is something that is commonly done in the art. (Wener, paragraph 30, Today, most of the existing...)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munarriz-Kadyk in view of Gorty et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 20050171996A1)

For claim 19, Munarriz-Kadyk the method of claim 15, wherein the server is a Post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name (Munarriz, paragraph 56 POP3, paragraph 47, login)

Munarriz-Kadyk fails to clearly disclose, said periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a UIDL command including said mailbox name to the server.

Gorty teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the server is a Post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and said periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a unique identification listing (UIDL) command including said mailbox name to the server. (Gorty, paragraph 23, periodic polling, uidl)

Munarriz-Kadyk and Gorty are both in the field of communicating with a POP servers

Munarriz-Kadyk and Gorty are compatible, because Gorty is the procedure of accessing a email on a POP server

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz-Kadyk with Gorty, by adding the feature of periodically checking the email account, because Gorty provides a more efficient means of accessing a POP email account. (Gorty, paragraph 9, 11)

For claim 29, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the server is a Post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name (Munarriz, paragraph 56 POP3, paragraph 47, login)

Munarriz-Kadyk fails to clearly disclose, said periodically determining technique comprises transmitting a UIDL command including said mailbox name to the server.

Gorty teaches, wherein the server is a Post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and a periodically determining technique comprises transmitting a unique identification listing (UIDL) command including said mailbox name to the server. (Gorty, paragraph 23, periodic polling, uidl)

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are both in the field of communicating with a POP servers

Munarriz-Kadyk and Gorty are compatible, because Gorty is the procedure of accessing a email on a POP server

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz-Kadyk with Gorty, by adding the feature of periodically checking the email account, because Gorty provides a more efficient means of accessing a POP email account. (Gorty, paragraph 9, 11)

(10) Response to Argument

A. Claims 1 through 17, 20, through 27, and 30 through 34 are unpatentable over Munarriz in view of Kadyk

Appellant brings argument by reviewing current case law relied upon.

Appellant argues that Kadyk does not teach "plurality of transactions," examiner disagrees. Appellant continues that the instructions of Kadyk are not "a plurality of transaction taking place between the gateway and the server" examiner relied upon Col. 3 lines 60 to Col. 4 lines 5, referring to the sequence of instructions referred to in cited paragraph:

Although not required, the invention will be described in the general context of computer-executable instructions, such as applications or program modules, being executed by computers in network environments. Generally, program modules include routines, programs, objects, components, data structures, etc. that perform particular tasks or implement particular abstract data types. Computer-executable instructions, associated data structures, and program modules represent examples of the program code means for executing steps of the methods disclosed herein. The particular sequence of such executable instructions or associated data structures represent examples of corresponding acts for implementing the functions described in such steps.

The cited portions of Kadyk in a sequence executes multiple instructions which are combined with the features of Munarriz.

Appellant goes on to argue that Col. 3 lines 46-60 discuss an expert proxy is not a proxy. Examiner notes that the prior art rejection provided in the final rejection relied upon Munarriz to teach the gateway in paragraph 54 which discusses the transmission of the messages to retrieve the emails and as can be seen in figure 8 the communication of the phone is with a gateway server. And Kadyk is combined with Munarriz to teach the obvious combination of one of skill to take the multiple transaction requests of Munnarriz into a sequence of executable instruction of Kadk therefore teaching the claimed invention. Kadyk argues that the expert proxy server in Kadyk is not a gateway, examiner disagrees. As the specification of appellant invention describes

that the "gateway compiles the retrieved information into a single response" which is the same as the expert proxy server of Kadyk, therefore Kadyk anticipates the gateway.

Appellant goes on to argues that examiner motivation to combine Munarriz and Kadk does not articulate a reasoning with some ration underpinning, examiner disagrees. By off loading the combination of sequence of executable instruction at the expert proxy server reduced the processing power required by the phone device of Munarriz, this allows for reduction in the requirements of the processor footprint and heat dissipation requirement allowing for a "simplified and smaller device."

B. Claim 18 and 28 are obvious over Munarriz and Kadyk in view of Wener

Appellant relies upon arguments addressed above to overcome the prior art in part A.

C. Claim 19 and 29 are obvious over Munarriz and Kadyk in view of Gorty

Appellant relies upon arguments addressed above to overcome the prior art in part A.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ajay Bhatia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

Conferees:

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/Patrice L Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452